

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:  
LEONTARIDIS, Athanasios  
Vosporou 61  
171 24 Nea Smirni  
GREECE

## PCT

### WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	04.04.2001
-------------------------------------	------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference

<b>REPLY DUE</b>	<b>within 3 month(s)</b> from the above date of mailing
------------------	--

International application No.  
PCT/GR00/00023

International filing date (day/month/year)  
28/06/2000

Priority date (day/month/year)  
28/06/1999

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
E05B65/08

Applicant

LEONTARIDIS, Athanasios

1. This written opinion is the **first** drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
  - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
  - II ☐ Priority
  - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
  - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
  - V ☐ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
  - VI ☐ Certain document cited
  - VII ☒ Certain defects in the international application
  - VIII ☒ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

**When?** See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

**Also:** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.  
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.  
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

**If no reply is filed**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: **28/10/2001**.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized officer / Examiner

Friedrich, A */ext. 2869*

Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits)

Lindquist, P  
Telephone No. +49 89 2399 2324



**I. Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"):

**Description, pages:**

1-21 as originally filed

**Claims, No.:**

1-13 as originally filed

**Drawings, sheets:**

1/9-9/9 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages:
- ☐ the claims, Nos.:

## WRITTEN OPINION

International application No. PCT/GR00/00023

---

☐ the drawings, sheets:

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)):

*(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)*

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

### VII. Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:  
**see separate sheet**

### VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:  
**see separate sheet**

**Re Item VII**

**Certain defects in the international application**

A document reflecting the prior art described on page 1 and 2, is not identified in the description (Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT). A relevant background art seems to be disclosed in the documents US-A-4 995 649 and FR-A-2 367 892 mentioned in the International Search Report.

**Re Item VIII**

**Certain observations on the international application**

Although claims 1, 2 and 11 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter.

The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness.

Moreover, lack of clarity of the claims as a whole arises, since the plurality of independent claims makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the matter for which protection is sought, and places an undue burden on others seeking to establish the extent of the protection.

Furthermore, in claim 11 feature "oblong hook profile" is mentioned in the characterizing part of the claim as already known. This is not the case since it was never disclosed in the preamble of the claim.

Hence, claims 1, 2 and 11 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

In order to overcome this objection, it would appear appropriate to file an amended set of claims defining the relevant subject-matter in terms of a single independent claim followed by dependent claims covering features which are merely optional (Rule 6.4 PCT).

Any information the applicant may wish to submit concerning the subject-matter of the invention, for example further details of its advantages or of the problem it solves, and for which there is no basis in the application as filed, should be confined to the letter of reply and not be incorporated into the application (Article 34(2)(b) PCT).